

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------------|--|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 10/621,478 | 07/17/2003 | James Gary Pruett | HTI.P.8213 | 2526 | |
| 23575 | 7590 01/09/2006 | | EXAMINER | | |
| CURATOLO SIDOTI CO., LPA | | | COLE, ELIZABETH M | | |
| | 24500 CENTER RIDGE ROAD, SUITE 28 CLEVELAND, OH 44145 | 1E 280 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1771 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 01/09/200 | DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|--|--|----|
| | | 10/621,478 | PRUETT ET AL. | |
| | Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | | Elizabeth M. Cole | 1771 | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence address | |
| WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
| Status | | | | |
| 1) | Responsive to communication(s) filed on | <u>_</u> . | | |
| 2a)⊠ | This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This | action is non-final. | | |
| 3) | Since this application is in condition for allowar | nce except for formal matters, pro | osecution as to the merits is | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under E | x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45 | 53 O.G. 213. | |
| Dispositi | on of Claims | | | |
| 4)⊠ | Claim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | |
| • | 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-41</u> is/are withdrawr | | | |
| 5) | Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | |
| 6)⊠ | Claim(s) 42-52 is/are rejected. | | | |
| 7) | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | |
| 8)□ | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | r election requirement. | | |
| Applicati | ion Papers | | | |
| 9)□ | The specification is objected to by the Examine | r. | | |
| - | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce | | Examiner. | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | | |
| | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct | ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob | jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d) | ١. |
| 11) | The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | aminer. Note the attached Office | Action or form PTO-152. | |
| Priority ι | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| a)[| Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list | s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | ion No ed in this National Stage | |
| 2) D Notic 3) D Inform | t(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other: | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/621,478 Page 2

Art Unit: 1771

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 42-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Wilson et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,155,432. Wilson discloses a structure comprising a substrate which comprises inorganic fibers and inorganic fiber whiskers. The inorganic fibers can comprise carbon fibers including those derived PAN, pitch or rayon precursor, ceramic fibers such as silicon carbide, silicon nitride, aluminosilicates and others. The inorganic fiber whiskers can comprise alumina, carbon, silica, glass silicon carbide, silicon nitride, titanium nitride and mixtures thereof. See col. 5, lines 28-42. The filter media can be in the form of paper, felts, needled felts, fabric, flat, shaped or corrugated plates, tubes, cylinder and corrugated or pleated cylinders. See col. 6, lines 11-15. a pyrolytic carbon coating can be formed on the filter media structure. See col. 7, lines 18-22. Wilson et al does not explicitly teach the claimed variation in the mass of the pyrolytic carbon coating. However, Wilson et al does teach forming a thin layer and it is reasonable to presume that the layer would be consistent. Further, when the reference discloses all the

Application/Control Number: 10/621,478 Page 3

Art Unit: 1771

limitations of a claim except a property or function, and the examiner cannot determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties which anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention the examiner has basis for shifting the burden of proof to applicant as in In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § \$2112-2112.02. Thus, in the instant case, the burden is shifted to applicant to show that the material of Wilson does not meet the claimed limitation regarding the variation in mass of the coating.

- 4. Applicant's election of Group IV in the reply filed on 10/27/05 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
- 5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/26/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Wilson does not teach a continuous roll composite material. However, Wilson teaches that the filter material may be in the form of tubes and cylinders which would correspond to a continuous roll composite material.

 Specifically, a tube or cylinder would necessarily be continuous by virtue of its being a tube or cylinder, since a non continuous material would not be a tube or cylinder but would instead have a different shape. The structure would further have a roll structure, i.e., have a cylindrical shape, and would be a composite since it comprises the substrate and the coating layer. Therefore, Wilson does teach a continuous roll composite material.
- 6. Applicant's amendment has overcome the 112 2nd paragraph rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/621,478 Page 4

Art Unit: 1771

7. Applicant's argument regarding the double patenting rejection is persuasive and the rejection is withdrawn.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth M. Cole whose telephone number is (571) 272-1475. The examiner may be reached between 6:30 AM and 6:00 PM Monday through Wednesday, and 6:30 AM and 2 PM on Thursday.

Mr. Terrel Morris, the examiner's supervisor, may be reached at (571) 272-1478.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The fax number for all official faxes is (571) 273-8300.

Page 5

Elizabeth M. Cole Primary Examiner Art Unit 1771

e.m.c